style, and *not churches*," must either be ignorant of the meaning of words, or in a person not to be argued with. Equally extraordinary is the notion that the early Christians "had not the power to perceive the Holy Scriptures contained the true principles of ecclesiastical design, on which they ought to have acted." Surely they knew more of the Scriptures than those to whom their perusal was forbidden. But "they were in the dark," says Mr. Lewis. "On Christian art, at which we need not wonder when their troublesome times we take into account." What, when the emperors of the world became Christians, when they bestowed their silver and gold, their most precious marbles, and richest bronzes; when all that the arts of imperial Rome could do was lavishly done—the palmy days from Constantine the conqueror to Justinian the law-giver, were those dark times? I will not waste words in refuting such dogmas. I will not take up your valuable columns nor your readers' time, by further notice of Mr. Lewis than to request he will quote me fairly in future, and not represent me as saying such nonsense as "after the Christian era had rolled away," or by referring my notice of the primitive and purer church, and its subsequent corruptions, to the architecture, instead of the religion of the times. If he would answer my "empty" queries instead of misquoting them, it would be, to say the least of it, the most creditable way.

I now contend that a *classic* church is a *Christian* church—nay, more, that the *type* of a Christian church is *originally classic*, and yet not Pagan. The classic architecture of the Romans may be called "Pagan" when applied to their temples; as we call the Gothic "monastic" when applied to abbeys and monasteries. But the type of the Christian church was *not the temple*, but the classic basilica Βασιλικος οικος, or court of justice, to which the term "Pagan" can no more apply than the term "monastic" to "castellated" Gothic. It is true that a man *might* call it by any name he pleases, *might* swear it is so, *might* dub you "impertinent" if you modestly doubt it; just as he *might* say, "St. Martin's-in-the-Fields is not a church, but a building in the style of Gibbs," and "St. Stephen's, Wallbrook, is not a church, but a building in the style of Wren." But a man *might* also call Dr. Croly a priest of Jupiter, and Mr. Alderman Gibbs a vestal virgin; my business is not with any such men, but with you, Sir, and your readers, who I know will regard argument and not assertion.

I now further contend, that the prominent features of the Roman basilica were, what we now call nave, aisles, clerestory, choir, and transepts; and that these are the true features of the Christian church; that they were maintained, with very few exceptions, through the different debasements of the Roman style, the Byzantine and Romanesque, to the early grotesqueness of the Norman. From thence, as better taste and fancy prevailed, the same type was preserved through the early English, ornamented, and Tudor styles in this country: and I do contend that our glorious cathedrals and abbey churches owe their original to a classic style; though parsimony on the one hand and quackery on the other forbid, for a time at least, any hope of a perfect development of it in our days.

Now let me endeavour to prove what I say point by point. Let us first inquire what the basilica was? Turn to Vitruvius, lib. 5, cap. 1, you will find he describes a rectangular oblong building, divided into three parts by rows of columns. The central part, or nave, he calls "testudo;" the side divisions, or aisles, he calls "porticus;" over the testudo he describes a blank space, or "pluteum," against which the rafters, "cantheris," of the porticus pitch; behind the columns are pilasters, "parastaticæ," on the tops of which the timbers, "contignationes" of the ceilings of the aisles rest; above the pluteum are other columns, "superiores columnæ" (bearing the roof of the testudo), between which, it appears, were windows, "lumina." Much difficulty has been found in making out this passage of Vitruvius; but thanks to his commentator Daniel Barbaro, and to the discovery of the remains of a basilica at Pompeii, I believe the main points are settled. At the end of the building, "extremis partibus," were "Chalcidica," of which more anon, and a "βημα," or "tribunal," forming a sweep less than a semicircle, "hemicycli schematis minore curvatura" (the chord being in fact to the versed sine as 46 : 15), and curving outwards to make room "negotiantes in basilica ne impedirent." So much for the general features of the basilica, as described by Vitruvius, and commented on (chiefly) by D. Barbaro (in loco) and by Palladio in his third book.

The next step is to shew the difference between the Pagan Temple and the Classic Basilica. This difference may be gathered partly from examples already existing, partly from Vitruvius, lib. 3, cap. 2 et seq. or more shortly from Palladio, book iii., chap. 7, and from his Fourth Book on Temples, especially the 5th chapter. It is shortly this: the porticus of the temple (I do not mean the entrance portico, but the ambulatory inclosed by ranges of columns) was outside the walls in the temple, and within side in the basilica. Palladio's words are—"We, by omitting the portico, build them (i. e. churches) very like basilicas, in which, as it has been said, porticos were made in the part within." It is true that the larger temples to Jupiter and the Dii majorum gentium had ranges of columns within, but these were all hypæthral, or without roof: see Vitruvius, lib. iii., chap. 2; and this Palladio and all the examples confirm. Besides this the temple had neither pluteum, chalcidicum, nor tribunal. There was, therefore, very material difference in the design and type of the temple and the basilica. The classic temple was, of course, of Pagan type—the classic basilica had nothing of the Pagan temple about it; and can no more be called Pagan than Windsor Castle can be called a monastery.

I must now crave a few words with regard to the chalcidicum. Much difference of opinion exists on this point, and when I remember that the best modern authority, a man of genius, a scholar, and a real architect, Mr. Joseph Gwilt, takes a very different view from mine, in which he is supported both by Perrault and the editor of the fine Utini edition of Vitruvius (1827), I must necessarily advance my own opinion with diffidence. At page 90 of his admirable Encyclopædia, in the plan of Pompeii, he calls the chalcidicum a single building (marked F) at a considerable distance from the basilica. But Vitruvius uses the word in the plural, and expressly says they (the chalcidica) were to be attached to the basilica at its extremity. "Sin autem locus erit amplior in longitudine, chalcidica in extremis partibus constituantur, uti sunt in Julia Aquiliana." "If the site be longer (than the proportions he has laid down of the length to the width, I. e. not less than a third nor more than a half), let the chalcidica (plural) be placed at the extreme end as they are in the basilica Julia Aquiliana." It is true, as Mr. Gwilt observes, that S. Pompeius Festus (de verborum significatione Amst. 1699, page 76) derives the name from Chalcis, a city of Eubœa. "*Chalcidicum*, genus est ædificii, a Chalcide dictum." This, however, does not explain either its use, form, or situation. Philander, however (in Vitruv. page 80, note, Edit. Amst. Elzevir. 1649), derives Chalcidicum from χαλκος money, and ἐκη justice; and supposes that it was either a mint or treasury. But I think it far more probable that they were places where the *mœdes* awarded by *justice* were paid; that they were, in fact, erections right and left of the tribunal, to which the parties retired to settle their money-matters, and to consult with their lawyers, just like the room at the side of the Queen's Bench Court at Guildhall, where the court fees and witnesses are paid. I am strengthened in this opinion by a passage in Leon Baptista Alberti (lib. vii. cap. 14, edit. G. Leoni, 1726), a very first-rate authority; in fact, it is conceded that his *Cœsidica* is identical with the *Chalcidica*, of which I have very little doubt, and in which I am supported by the authority of Polenus, I think there is an end of the matter. Alberti's words are these: "Aggiunsero dipoi al traverso del Tribunale una Nave, la quale noi chiamiamo *Cœsidica*, perciochè in quel luogo concorrevano Notari, Procuratori, ed Avocati; e congiunsero insieme queste Navi a similitudine della lettera T." "They joined them, at right angles to the Tribunal, a nave which we call *Cœsidica*, because in this place the notaries, proctors, and advocates, congregate, and they joined these naves (plural) together like the letter T." And shortly after he says, "E la nave a traverso, che diciamo cœsidica." "And the *cross nave* which we call Cœsidica." The βημα, or tribunal, of course projected between them, and formed one limb of a cross, the testudo and aisle formed the long limb, and the chalcidica the transepts; in fact, the Italians at this day call the transepts "crociata."

The next step in my proof is that the early Christians copied the basilica in building their churches. This is commonly known, and easily proved by reference to the plans of those now existing, as San Paolo, &c. &c. But there is a passage in Palladio so much to the purpose, that I venture to transcribe it: it is in Book iv. chap. 5. "This happened because the first who, enlightened by truth, gave themselves up to our religion, were accustomed, for fear of the Gentiles, to assemble in the basilicas of private men; whence, seeing that this succeeded very well, because the altar was placed with great dignity in the place of the tribunal, and the choir stood very conveniently about the altar, and the remaining part was free for the people, it has not been altered since."

Now, Sir, we find shortly after this that the testudo took the name of *nave*, or ship, from a fancied resemblance to the Ark that saved Noah and the human race—the porticus were called *alæ*, or *aisles*. The βημα, or tribunal, became the *choir* or *chancel* (in fact, it retained its name βημα a long time, see Bingham's Christian Antiquities, vol. iii. 186), the circular end became an *apsis*, the pluteum and superiores columnæ became our *clerestory* (see the plates to book vii. of Alberti's Architecture, Leoni's edition), and the Chalcidica (mis-fallor) became the Italian *crociata*, and our own *transepts*.

Thus, Sir, from a purely classic model, we have the entire type of a Christian church.

But let me take another line of reasoning. If churches in the style of the naves of Winchester and Canterbury are conceded to be Christian churches, there can be no reason to exclude Salisbury and buildings in the lancet style; and though preciously to this the windows, doors, &c. had circular instead of pointed arches, and instead of piers and bolt-is there were heavy squat columns, there can be no cause to excommunicate the Anglo-Norman or Saxon styles. Surely these were also Christian churches. If this be conceded, why should the Lombardic and Romanesque churches be un-Christianised, whose only difference was that the columns were smaller, and their caps more like Roman capitals? And if the Christianity of these be admitted, why not that of the Byzantine churches, which differed only in a less pure style from those of Constantine? And these last, as I trust I have proved, were the classic basilicæ.

The argument against classic architecture is not new to me, because I have met with pseudo-*Ecclesiologists* before; it stands thus *dialectice*:—

Churches with Roman columns, entablatures, &c. are classic churches.

But—the Romans were Pagans.

Ergo—St. Martin's-in-the-Fields (being in the classic style) is a Pagan church.

It might as well be said, "The Romans were book-nosed; *ergo*, nobody should go to St. Martin's but book-nosed men."

You, Mr. Editor, will immediately see the logical fallacy in the syllogism. I endeavoured to illustrate it in my last letter by a *reductio ad absurdum*, thus:—

The Latin was the language of the Romans.

But—the Romans were Pagans.

Ergo—St. Cyprian (one of the Fathers of the Church), who wrote in Latin, was a Pagan.

The absurdity is apparent, and is, I still contend, an exact parallel to the dictum, "Classic is not Christian."

I find I am, against my will, compelled to notice Mr. Lewis once more. He demands my name and address, "that we may be on equal terms." I think we are on equal terms now; I have made no sort of personal allusion to *him*, but have merely commented on *his letters*. "Quod scripsi, scripsi," he can do no with mine. But from his calling me "empty, impertinent," &c., I fancy he seems to be inclined to be personal. This is a thing I cannot stoop to. I think, therefore, by giving my name I shall put myself on *unequal* instead of equal terms with him. No, Sir, I think I shall keep to my old signature, 'tis one I am proud of, though, I fear, not so deserving of as very many. I shall continue to subscribe myself as, Sir,

Your sincere admirer,

AN OLD-FASHIONED ARCHITECT.

THE LEVIATHAN TELESCOPE.—The Rev. Dr. Robinson, the celebrated astronomer, of Armagh, in a letter to the writer, describes the gigantic telescope, now constructing by the Earl of Rosse, as nearly complete. He says—"The speculum, which weighs three tons, has been ground to figure, and can be polished in a day. The tube, partly a cubic chamber where the mirror is fixed, and partly a cylinder, of inch deal, strongly hooped, and eight feet diameter at its centre, is complete. The massive centres on which the telescope is to turn are in their place, and the apparatus which supports the speculum, which is of iron and of great weight, is also complete. The telescope is not to be turned to any part of the sky, but limited to a range of half hour on each side of the meridian, through which its motion will be given by powerful clockwork, independent of the observer. For this purpose it stands between two pieces of masonry of Gothic architecture, which harmonise well with the castle. One of these pillars will sustain the galleries for the observer, and the other the clockwork and other machinery; one of which is finished, and the other nearly completed. An extremely elegant arrangement of counterpoises is intended to balance the enormous mass, so that a comparatively slight force only will be required to elevate or depress it, much of which is also completed; and Lord Rosse considers that two months will be sufficient to have the instrument fit for trial. The arrangements will not permit the examination of an object at any time, but only when near the meridian, when objects are best seen. So large a telescope will always require the most favourable circumstances of air, &c., and there will always be enough of objects at any given time to employ it fully. The aperture is six feet, and the focal length 52 feet."

For more information on PDF Compression and OCR visit TheArchiveBusinessOffice.org